

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA - WESTERN DIVISION
HONORABLE JOHN F. WALTER, U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
)	
PLAINTIFF,)	CASE NO.
)	
vs.)	CR 20-326-JFW
)	
JOSE LUIS HUIZAR,)	
)	PAGES 1 TO 68
DEFENDANT.)	
)	

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF
TRIAL SETTING CONFERENCE
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 5, 2020
8:04 A.M.
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

MIRANDA ALGORRI, CSR 12743, RPR, CRR
FEDERAL OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
350 WEST 1ST STREET, SUITE 4455
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
MIRANDAALGORRI@GMAIL.COM

APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF:

NICOLA T. HANNA
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY
BY: MACK JENKINS
BY: VERONICA DRAGALIN
BY: MELISSA MILLS
Assistant United States Attorneys
United States Courthouse
312 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

FOR THE DEFENDANT:

HILARY L. POTASHNER
FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER
BY: CAREL ALE
BY: CHARLES SNYDER
Deputy Federal Public Defenders
Central District of California
321 East Second Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

ALSO PRESENT:

Special Agent Andrew Civetti
Special Agent Tony Logan

1 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA; WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 5, 2020

2 8:04 A.M.

3 ---

4
5 THE CLERK: Calling CR 20-326-JFW, United States
6 of America versus Jose Luis Huizar.

7 Counsel, please state your appearances.

8 MR. JENKINS: Good morning, Your Honor.

9 Mack Jenkins, Veronica Dragalin,
10 Special Agent Andrew Civetti, AUSA Melissa Mills, and in the
11 jury box Special Agent Tony Logan from the FBI on behalf of the
12 United States.

13 MS. ALE: Good morning, Your Honor.

14 Carel Ale and Charles Snyder from the Office of
15 the Federal Public Defender on behalf of Mr. Huizar who is
16 present and out of custody today.

17 THE COURT: All right. Good morning to all.

18 This matter is on the Court's calendar for a
19 Trial Setting Conference. Before I set a trial date in this
20 matter, I'm going to ask Government counsel to advise us of the
21 nature of the charges alleged in this 117-page Indictment and
22 how the Government expects to prove those charges at trial. I
23 will ask the Government to tell me the estimated number of
24 witnesses that the Government intends to call, its trial
25 estimate, and the status of discovery and whether or not there

1 were any searches and whether or not the defendant made any
2 statements that the Government intends to use at trial.

3 Because of the scope of the Indictment, I'm going
4 to ask counsel to discuss the Government's evidence with
5 respect to the overt acts charged in the RICO conspiracy. I
6 think that will capture a great deal of the evidence --
7 Project E bribery scheme which is alleged overt acts 1 through
8 69, the Project C bribery scheme which is captured by overt
9 acts 70 to 103, the Project D bribery scheme which is overt
10 acts 104 to 197, the Project M bribery scheme which is overt
11 acts 199 to 256, and the Businessperson A scheme, overt acts
12 290 to 296.

13 I've got some specific questions about the money
14 laundering charges and whether or not the Government intends to
15 supersede the Indictment to add any of the individuals that are
16 named in those counts as well as the tax count which is
17 Count 34 which is alleged against the defendant.

18 So who is going to speak on behalf of the
19 Government?

20 MR. JENKINS: I will, Your Honor. Mr. Jenkins.

21 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Jenkins.

22 MR. JENKINS: Yes, Your Honor.

23 Count 1, as the Court noted, charges the
24 racketeering conspiracy, and I will get to the supporting
25 evidence that the Court requested but outlining the remainder

1 of the substantive counts.

2 Counts 2 through 4 charge honest services fraud
3 by wire. Those are Counts 2 through 4.

4 Counts 16 through 19 charge violations of the
5 travel act related to trips to Las Vegas and Australia during
6 which it was alleged Council Member -- Defendant Huizar
7 accepted bribes during those trips.

8 Count 20 is a substantive federal program bribery
9 violation related to \$575,000 in collateral that is alleged to
10 have been received by Defendant Huizar from Chairman E as part
11 of a bribery scheme.

12 Counts 20 through 25, all of those are federal
13 program bribery schemes.

14 Counts 26 through 29 relate to money laundering
15 facilitated by a person identified as Relative A-2 on behalf of
16 Defendant Huizar.

17 Count 30 is another form of money laundering or
18 it is alleged that Defendant Huizar caused a co-conspirator to
19 transport bribery proceeds back from Australia that were
20 provided by Chairman E.

21 Count 31 is a structuring allegation related to
22 the same co-conspirator acting on behalf of Defendant Huizar
23 attempting to evade reporting requirements and the transactions
24 related to that Australian bribe money.

25 Count 32 alleges a bank fraud, specifically a

1 false statement related to Defendant Huizar's failure to
2 include that \$575,000 collateral/loan that was provided to him
3 by Chairman E and which should have been reported as a
4 liability on his loan application.

5 Count 33 charges false statement related to our
6 interview with Defendant Huizar who was present with counsel,
7 advised that lying to the FBI was a crime, and it was alleged
8 that he lied during that interview about his desire to receive
9 bribe money from Developer E through Justin Kim and
10 co-conspirator George Esparza.

11 Finally, Count 34 relates to tax evasion,
12 specifically 2017, and failures to report money received, bribe
13 money received, and efforts to launder money in order to
14 conceal income which also affected the accuracy of that tax
15 return.

16 I will focus now, before going to the remainder
17 of the Court's questions, focus on the specific schemes if you
18 would like at this point, or I could move to your other
19 questions related to the trial estimate.

20 THE COURT: No. You can focus on the schemes.
21 Obviously the -- I'm going to ask you to do it in summary form.
22 I'm particularly interested in you addressing -- for each of
23 those schemes identify the parties, the entities, and the
24 approximate dates, the amount of the alleged bribe, who paid
25 the bribe and who received the bribe, and whether or not there

1 are any cooperating witnesses who are percipient to each of
2 those bribery schemes who will be testifying on behalf of the
3 Government.

4 MR. JENKINS: Yes, Your Honor. Beginning with
5 page 14, the Project E bribery scheme as alleged in Count 1 of
6 the RICO conspiracy count, in summary, that alleges that
7 Chairman E, who owns a hotel in the downtown Los Angeles area
8 and who did so at the time, became acquainted with then Council
9 Member Huizar through Individual One who at the time was a
10 high-level government official.

11 THE COURT: Let me interrupt you.

12 Are we going to continue to use these
13 descriptions of these entities and these individuals now that
14 we have what appears to be almost the end of or the conclusion
15 of the investigation?

16 MR. JENKINS: Yes, Your Honor. For two reasons.
17 One, the investigation is -- remains ongoing as to many of
18 these other entities that are obscured or masked as we
19 described. The DOJ policy is for entities or persons that are
20 implicated but not yet charged in crimes.

21 THE COURT: You think they're masked, but
22 everybody can pretty much figure them out. Certainly the press
23 has no difficulty making inferences as to who these -- several
24 of these individuals are or the companies involved. I am not
25 as familiar with the evidence at this point in time. So my

1 problem is, every time I read something, I've got to go back
2 and figure out, okay, who is this individual and which scheme
3 does he fit in -- he or she and which time period.

4 If you're going to continue, as you say, masking
5 these individuals, I would ask that you prepare a list that you
6 can file in camera which will -- I have started one, but it
7 just gets to be -- gets to be too cumbersome in terms of
8 matching these various descriptions with actual names of real
9 people.

10 MR. JENKINS: Understood, Your Honor. And we
11 have such a list that I am prepared to provide to the Court in
12 camera at this point now.

13 THE COURT: Okay. I don't need it today. Just
14 file it -- you can actually -- you don't need to file it in
15 camera. You can just leave a copy of it with Shannon, and then
16 I will be able to -- every time I read this -- when you're
17 reading on page 85 and a name comes up and I have to figure out
18 who you are talking about.

19 In any event, I interrupted you. Go ahead.

20 MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Your Honor.

21 And for the people who have been publicly
22 charged, we will use their names as we did in the Indictment.
23 We understand the Court's concern. And at some point we do
24 expect to identify them, and at the Court's direction, we can
25 do so. We were just advising that the policy of the office is

1 to do it in the way we did.

2 THE COURT: Are you prepared to do that in the
3 near future?

4 MR. JENKINS: Yes, Your Honor.

5 THE COURT: How long? By when?

6 MR. JENKINS: We are prepared to do it now as to
7 ones that have been reported by the media, or the next step
8 would be when they were charged if any are to be charged.

9 THE COURT: Well, I don't know how we can -- I
10 will throw this out. If you are prepared to identify certain
11 of these individuals and certain of the entities that you feel
12 comfortable disclosing, perhaps it would be appropriate to file
13 a -- I don't know what you are going to call it -- a list of
14 parties -- I will let you be creative in terms of the title --
15 but then you can publicly file that, and then it will be
16 available to the press so they don't have to continue to make
17 assumptions as to who these people are. If you can do that
18 within the next ten days, I think -- or earlier, that would be
19 helpful.

20 MR. JENKINS: Very well, Your Honor. We will run
21 that up the chain, and that sounds doable. But for purposes of
22 today, we will continue in --

23 THE COURT: Aren't you the end of the chain?

24 MR. JENKINS: Not on this case, Your Honor.

25 The Count 1 Project E bribery scheme, the summary

1 as described was that Company E and its chairman became
2 acquainted with Council Member Huizar through Individual One in
3 February of 2013. We believe quickly thereafter, specifically
4 in March, so the next month in 2013, Defendant Huizar and this
5 Chairman E began the onset of a corrupt relationship
6 particularly through luxury trips to Las Vegas, among other
7 places, where Chairman E would provide various forms of
8 financial benefits both directly and indirectly to
9 Defendant Huizar, specifically chips and -- gambling chips in
10 the thousands of dollars, luxury hotel stays.

11 Because Chairman E was known as a high level
12 gambling player, he got various comps including hotel rooms
13 that would retail up to \$30,000 per night, and he allowed
14 Defendant Huizar and others to utilize.

15 We believe, based off the evidence, that that
16 relationship progressed and continued up and through 2018,
17 included over a dozen trips. Such trips, the benefits also
18 included things like spas, trips to restaurants, and other
19 benefits provided to Defendant Huizar.

20 The witnesses who will testify to the facts
21 therein including percipient witnesses who were on those trips
22 include George Esparza, Defendant Huizar's special assistant at
23 the time. There is also Executive E who was described as a
24 right-hand person of Chairman E who also testified about the
25 benefits provided from Chairman E to Defendant Huizar and his

1 special assistant George Esparza.

2 In addition, there is voluminous casino
3 surveillance evidence of Defendant Huizar gambling with chips
4 provided by Chairman E and one specific occasion that caught
5 the attention of the casino surveillance. Defendant Huizar was
6 observed with over \$60,000 in chips. Because, at that point
7 the casino surveillance that identified Defendant Huizar as a
8 council member in the City of Los Angeles as part of their
9 normal surveillance and security to protect themselves and
10 concerns relating to money laundering and other illicit
11 activity, they have forms that they require called PEP forms,
12 politically exposed person, where they want to identify
13 potential politicians to ensure they are using their own money.

14 During one such trip, when the \$60,000 in front
15 of Defendant Huizar provided by Chairman E was being utilized,
16 the casino representative encountered Defendant Huizar, asked
17 him to fill out a form that would confirm his identity and the
18 course of the chips he was playing with. Defendant Huizar
19 declined, immediately left the table after speaking briefly
20 with Executive E, left the \$60 ,000 on the table, and departed
21 soon thereafter and did not return to Las Vegas to that casino
22 for some time after. We have interviewed the people involved
23 in that encounter including executive employee and others who
24 witnessed that.

25 The others -- other evidence from that will

1 include cashout documentation, that is, evidence that
2 Defendant Huizar would cash out chips, and that would be
3 documented by casinos in terms of how much money he cashed out.
4 The casinos also note particularly when people cash out
5 significant amounts of money but never cash in. I mean, they
6 don't go to a cashier and here is my \$2,000, please provide me
7 chips. That is ordinarily documented. So when someone,
8 particularly a council member, cashes out chips, there is no
9 record of a cash in, that attracts the attention of casino
10 surveillance, and that was monitored at several casinos.

11 That relationship continued through other trips
12 to Australia as alleged in the Indictment and the trip to
13 Northern California most recently.

14 THE COURT: So of all of those trips to Vegas --
15 Las Vegas, Australia, et cetera, how much is the Government --
16 what is the Government's evidence going to show in terms of how
17 much was received by the defendant?

18 MR. JENKINS: Yes, Your Honor.

19 THE COURT: Just approximately.

20 MR. JENKINS: Certainly. And there's two
21 different ways to evaluate it. One is the gambling chips.
22 Sort of the easiest way is direct benefits, gambling chips, and
23 that's 260 -- approximately \$260,000. In addition, according
24 to the chart on pages 15 and 16, we have alleged what we
25 describe as group expenses. Again, that relates to things that

1 Defendant Huizar participated in and enjoyed. I think the
2 \$30,000 per night luxury suite but so did others. So without
3 itemizing each for each person, we refer to those as group
4 expenses provided by Chairman E that Defendant Huizar enjoyed
5 some part of, and that was approximately \$900,000.

6 THE COURT: All right. So in exchange for that,
7 what was -- what was Chairman E or his company asking of the
8 defendant, if anything? What is the Government's theory as to
9 that?

10 MR. JENKINS: Yes, Your Honor. We believe there
11 were several "asks" by the chairman to benefit his company
12 which was a hotel -- which is a hotel in downtown Los Angeles
13 that he had bought earlier -- prior to the relationship with
14 Defendant Huizar. He was the owner of this hotel among -- and
15 another property in the city. Originally there were several
16 favors asked by Chairman E, but the most specific ones that we
17 would rely on is first a 2014 city council resolution for a
18 Chinese national business who was one of the first Chinese
19 nationals to take over a downtown Los Angeles hotel in order to
20 curry business support and other favorable treatment by the
21 city community. He sought a resolution from the city council
22 highlighting his contributions to the local economy.

23 Jose Huizar provided such resolution, and that
24 resolution was widely hailed or was highlighted by the chairman
25 to others in the company as a significant benefit that would

1 essentially vouch for his new project or his new hotel and its
2 business.

3 In addition, during the progression of the
4 relationship between Defendant Huizar and Chairman E,
5 Chairman E made it clear that he wanted his downtown LA hotel
6 to be transformed into the largest tower west of the
7 Mississippi which would create specifically a 77-floor mixed
8 retail space which would come at significant costs to the
9 company and at the same time would require significant city
10 entitlement process, and he needed and wanted Defendant Huizar
11 to help along that process.

12 THE COURT: And was the help given?

13 MR. JENKINS: It was not, Your Honor. I take it
14 back. It depends what specific help we are discussing.

15 The project itself in October of 2018, I believe,
16 there is -- June -- thank you, Ms. Dragalin -- in June of 2018,
17 there was an application to do just what was described, that
18 is, transform this hotel into the largest tower west of the
19 Mississippi. Prior to that -- in October 2018, that
20 application was made, but before any votes could be taken on it
21 in November '18, the FBI raided city hall including
22 Jose Huizar's council district office, his Boyle Heights
23 office, his residence, and other locations as was widely
24 reported in the media.

25 We believe, because of that public intervention,

1 it stalled Chairman E's interests in Defendant Huizar's ability
2 to help at that point. Prior to that point, there was a
3 meeting at city hall including the chairman and
4 Defendant Huizar, including Individual One, including
5 Defendant Huizar's planning director and others from the City
6 where that -- the plan was discussed. So there was this
7 meeting related to the tower prior to that. And ultimately we
8 believe or allege that there is an agreement to help, and the
9 help was in process prior to our public intervention into --
10 via the search warrants.

11 THE COURT: All right. Is this the funding --
12 the alleged funding of the -- some 5- or \$600,000 settlement of
13 the lawsuit that the defendant was involved in?

14 MR. JENKINS: That is, say, the next part of the
15 Project E bribery scheme. There is essentially the trips part
16 component, and then, in addition, during that time period, as
17 you described, Chairman E facilitated by Individual One in
18 short allowed Defendant Huizar, who was in a contested
19 re-election at the time, to privately and confidentially settle
20 a sexual harassment lawsuit filed by an individual with whom he
21 had an affair who was suing him. And he provided -- that is,
22 Chairman E provided approximately \$600,000 to confidentially
23 settle that lawsuit via a collateral and loan to
24 Defendant Huizar.

25 I believe that is another in a stream of benefits

1 theory, another significant benefit that was provided to
2 Defendant Huizar for the same purposes described.

3 THE COURT: This was done by way of a posting of
4 collateral for a loan that Mr. Huizar obtained and
5 ultimately -- I mean, he defaulted on the loan, and the bank
6 foreclosed on the collateral that had been posted by Chairman E
7 or Chairman E's company?

8 MR. JENKINS: That is correct, Your Honor. That
9 occurred in December of 2018 and was approximately \$570,000.

10 THE COURT: Is that the basis for the false
11 statement count that is alleged in Count 32?

12 MR. JENKINS: That is correct, Your Honor.

13 THE COURT: Okay.

14 MR. JENKINS: That forms essentially the core of
15 the Project E bribery scheme.

16 THE COURT: All right. There were other issues
17 that you alleged in this Indictment that Chairman E made a
18 request of Mr. Huizar and that is a letter of recommendation
19 for his son at USC, some visa application support, and there
20 was a labor union issue. What was the labor union issue?

21 MR. JENKINS: Our understanding from interviews
22 related to the labor union or interviews with the labor union
23 is that Chairman E's hotels or hotel -- I think both of them --
24 had issues, basically human resource issues, with labor and
25 were having disputes resolving those -- were having issues

1 resolving those disputes with the labor unions regarding these
2 H.R. issues. According to the labor union, Jose Huizar reached
3 out to try to litigate or mitigate those disputes on behalf of
4 Chairman E or Chairman E's company.

5 THE COURT: Let's move on with project -- bribery
6 Project C. What is the overview of the evidence the Government
7 will offer for that project?

8 MR. JENKINS: Yes, Your Honor. Project C, which
9 begins on page 25 of the Indictment, relates to a separate
10 project and separate developer referred to as Developer C.
11 This developer became aware that a significant project, his
12 second largest property -- he is a developer who owns multiple
13 properties -- his second largest property that he was seeking
14 to redevelop had a labor union issue. Specifically, the labor
15 union had filed an appeal on the project which threatened to
16 slow down or halt the project or increase the project costs.

17 At this time Developer C engaged Justin Kim who
18 was at the time a known and close ally of Defendant Huizar, one
19 of his top fundraisers. Justin Kim's actual job related to
20 real estate appraisal. According to Justin Kim, he contacted
21 George Esparza, then Defendant Huizar's special assistant,
22 seeking help, seeking Jose Huizar's help resolving this appeal
23 on behalf of David Lee.

24 After much back and forth, it was decided that
25 that help, according to Defendant Huizar through

1 George Esparza, that it would cost Developer C financial
2 benefits in order for Defendant Huizar to weigh in,
3 particularly because Defendant Huizar is publicly known to be
4 an ally of labor unions. So in the event that he took any
5 action that was adverse to a labor union, it could cost him
6 political clout. So he wanted it to cost financial -- it would
7 be a trade or required financial benefits for him to risk that
8 clout.

9 Ultimately it was agreed from Developer C who
10 offered \$500,000 in cash to make the appeal issue go away.
11 That money was in summary provided from Developer C to
12 Justin Kim to George Esparza who I believe on at least one
13 occasion traveled to Defendant Huizar's home the same day he
14 had obtained hundreds of thousands of dollars in cash in a
15 paper bag. George Esparza transferred that money to a liquor
16 box, a small Jack Daniel's, some liquor box, transported it to
17 Defendant Huizar's home, showed Defendant Huizar that
18 Justin Kim and Developer C had come through on their end of the
19 bargain because at that point the appeal had been dropped
20 meaning that Defendant Huizar held up his end of the bargain.

21 According to George Esparza, during that
22 conversation which occurred in March 2017, Defendant Huizar was
23 concerned of having cash -- that large amount of cash in his
24 home, particularly during the time where there was rumors of an
25 FBI investigation into him. According to George Esparza, he

1 said, *You keep it, hide it, hold on to it for me.*

2 That interaction, including the money, the
3 delivery or, I would say, the attempted delivery to
4 Jose Huizar's house up to his doorstep was documented by
5 George Esparza in videos and photographs describing what he was
6 doing, how much was in there, and Defendant Huizar's response.

7 That money then was taken back by George Esparza
8 for safekeeping who ultimately transferred it to executive
9 employee E or Executive E who worked for Chairman E because
10 George Esparza also became concerned about having that large
11 stash of cash in his house.

12 Ultimately, as the FBI investigation progressed
13 including interviews of George Esparza, George Esparza became
14 concerned that at least some part of their scheme was
15 discovered. So instead of providing the money to
16 Defendant Huizar, he kept it with Executive E.

17 During that time George Esparza and
18 Defendant Huizar had multiple text conversations or, I should
19 say, Defendant Huizar had multiple text conversations with
20 George Esparza who largely unanswered -- largely did not
21 respond to those text messages. Defendant Huizar's messages
22 were essentially, *We had a plan. We had a meeting. We were*
23 *supposed to meet. Why aren't we meeting up?* Messages to that
24 effect.

25 According to George Esparza, the intent of those

1 messages was Defendant Huizar wanted his share of the bribery
2 cash, and that included Defendant Huizar showing up uninvited
3 at George Esparza's house, according to George Esparza, to
4 collect the money. Ultimately, as alleged in the Indictment,
5 various meeting dates between the two came and went, and
6 George Esparza did not provide the money.

7 And in one recorded conversation prior to that,
8 in Defendant Huizar's private city hall bathroom, he made clear
9 that he expected that money, that he was entitled to that
10 money, and that he needed that money because his wife,
11 Richelle Rios, was running for re-election -- excuse me --
12 running to succeed him in the election.

13 THE COURT: So she -- so Mr. Huizar never
14 received any part of that money?

15 MR. JENKINS: That is correct, Your Honor.

16 THE COURT: So the only one that received part of
17 that money is Esparza?

18 MR. JENKINS: In addition, Justin Kim --

19 THE COURT: And Kim kept the 100,000.

20 MR. JENKINS: That is correct, Your Honor.

21 THE COURT: So Esparza got 100-; Kim got 100-.

22 What happened to the rest of it? It went back to Developer C?

23 MR. JENKINS: No. We're not sure -- at this
24 point we are still evaluating the ultimate breakdown. That's
25 why it's sort of, as the Court points out, is not entirely

1 clear of the breakdown. What is accurate is David Lee provided
2 in total \$500,000. The evidence is that his intent is that was
3 to supply Defendant Huizar and take care of the appeal issue.
4 Ultimately Defendant Huizar received none of that money, and it
5 was ultimately split between George Esparza to help with
6 resolving the appeal and his efforts in addition with
7 Justin Kim and his efforts in facilitating the bribe.

8 THE COURT: I may have missed it, but ultimately
9 what happened with the appeal?

10 MR. JENKINS: The appeal was dropped, Your Honor.

11 THE COURT: It was dropped.

12 MR. JENKINS: Yes. Prior to the money being
13 provided by Developer Lee, it was confirmed that it was
14 dropped, and that information was conveyed from George Esparza
15 to Justin Kim to David to Developer C.

16 THE COURT: According to overt act 78, this
17 compensation or this money started out to be a million two. It
18 was supposed to be 500,000 for the defendant, 500,000 to Kim,
19 and 200,000 to Esparza, but apparently Developer C or
20 representatives of Developer C came back with a counteroffer of
21 500,000. That is how it ended up?

22 MR. JENKINS: Yes, Your Honor.

23 THE COURT: And who is percipient to the original
24 conversations setting the \$1.2 million amount of the alleged
25 bribe?

1 MR. JENKINS: That would be the testimony of
2 George Esparza, Defendant Huizar's special assistant. In
3 addition, Defendant Esparza made a habit of documenting
4 contemporaneously his conversations with Defendant Huizar
5 particularly when they related to criminal conduct. So there
6 is, according to the metadata, notes consistent with that
7 conversation, but ultimately the percipient witness is
8 George Esparza.

9 THE COURT: Is there anything other than
10 Mr. Esparza's testimony?

11 MR. JENKINS: In addition to his notes, not that
12 we are aware of at this time, Your Honor.

13 THE COURT: Okay. And that forms the basis for I
14 believe the Count 33 which is the false statement?

15 MR. JENKINS: Let me just confirm that,
16 Your Honor.

17 THE COURT: April 2019 false statement?

18 MR. JENKINS: Yes. That is correct.

19 THE COURT: All right. Let's move on to
20 Project D.

21 MR. JENKINS: Yes, Your Honor. Project D relates
22 to a separate Chinese national developer with a separate hotel
23 and project in Council District 14, Defendant Huizar's
24 district. Similarly this relationship was facilitated by
25 Individual One, more specifically meaning introduced by

1 Individual One. After that point the individuals on behalf of
2 Company D, which included various employees, made various
3 requests of Defendant Huizar including help with certain
4 activities related to their hotel.

5 Defendant Huizar and Individual One provided,
6 according to the evidence, some of that assistance. Around the
7 same time Individual One and Defendant Huizar began soliciting
8 financial benefits or contributions -- and contributions from
9 development -- from Company D and its chairman. At some point
10 the conversations continued including about the need for the
11 council member to help Project D which at the time was going
12 through very significant redevelopment efforts, efforts that,
13 according to Chairman D, had been delayed or otherwise not on
14 his time schedule which could potentially cost Chairman D and
15 Company D the viability of that project.

16 Accordingly, at some point it became clear that
17 Defendant Huizar, in addition to asking for contributions, also
18 had other ideas of how Chairman D and Company D could be
19 helpful to Defendant Huizar including by hiring an associate of
20 Defendant Huizar.

21 In addition, there were other requests that were
22 discussed including hiring Defendant Huizar's wife by
23 Company D. In addition, there was, as I mentioned, the
24 political contributions. During this time there was continual
25 efforts by Company D and its chairman and its employees and

1 Individual One to ensure that Project D achieved its various
2 entitlements, and the project moved forward in a timely
3 fashion.

4 Ultimately there were -- one of the first schemes
5 alleged beginning at page 34 related to consulting fees to an
6 associate alleged as Huizar Associate One related to a scheme
7 that was purported to be a real estate arrangement or agreement
8 that originally was purported to include Defendant Huizar's
9 wife as a participant in the real estate process that she was
10 supposed to provide information that would be ultimately
11 provided to China related to Southern California property
12 values and real estate opportunities.

13 According to testimony including from
14 Defendant Huizar's wife, she had no interest in such
15 opportunity, had no expertise or knowledge of such real estate
16 opportunities, and declined to participate because she thought
17 it was suspicious.

18 Instead, George Chiang, a consultant who worked
19 with Individual One and one of the individuals who is alleged
20 to participate in the racketeering enterprise with
21 Defendant Huizar, ultimately he was the one that prepared these
22 real estate reports that ultimately were purchased by a
23 relative of Chairman D according -- pursuant to an agreement by
24 which \$11,000 per month will be provided to these reports. The
25 \$11,000 per month was provided ultimately to Huizar Associate

1 One.

2 According to Huizar Associate One, he did very
3 little to earn any of this money. He did not understand what
4 the point of the arrangement was about, but he continued to
5 accept the money for six months and accepted what he thought to
6 be real estate appraisals, property values from -- he was
7 unaware that the source of the information was, in fact,
8 George Chiang who was at that time working in association with
9 Chairman D.

10 THE COURT: Wait. All these real estate reports
11 1 through 6, those are all designed to accomplish the payment
12 that Mr. Huizar apparently made request to pay or hire his
13 associate because Company D, or whoever was involved in
14 Project D, did not want to make these direct payments. So they
15 concocted this scheme of the preparation of these real estate
16 reports, and it was a backdoor way of funneling the money to
17 the individual that Huizar asked the company to hire?

18 MR. JENKINS: Exactly, Your Honor.

19 THE COURT: All right. So I understand the
20 benefits that were flowing. But my question is, in exchange
21 for those benefits, what did Mr. Huizar do with respect to this
22 Project D? What's the conduct or acts that the Government is
23 going to that either promoted the approval process of Project D
24 or what did he do? That's the key question. Is this an
25 undeveloped piece of property, Project D, or was this a rehab?

1 MR. JENKINS: This was a redevelopment project
2 involving a current large hotel in downtown Los Angeles that
3 Company D also wanted to transform, and according to internal
4 documentation, they believed that the transformation would
5 result in a property worth in the hundreds of millions of
6 dollars.

7 Defendant Huizar at the time where, according to
8 similar internal communications, Chairman D was concerned that
9 the project purportedly foreseen to be worth those hundreds of
10 millions of dollars would not come to fruition. So Chairman D
11 was putting out a lot of pressure including on George Chiang to
12 make his project happen.

13 What ultimately happened directly because of
14 Defendant Huizar is, on November 22nd, 2016, which is overt act
15 160, Defendant Huizar presented a written motion in the
16 Economic Development Committee on which he sat to benefit
17 Project D. Those such motions -- there is essentially various
18 benefits or entitlements which are, generally speaking, things
19 that project needed to have done, needed to get done in order
20 for the project to succeed. I think, for example, if it wants
21 to transform a house into a hotel, there would be -- and that
22 is not the exact example. But if that was the request, there
23 would be multiple City approvals needed to change zoning or ask
24 for other tax benefits or seek height adjustments or develop
25 affordable housing requirements.

1 So specifically here there was an Economic
2 Development Committee motion that was presented by
3 Defendant Huizar. Subsequently he voted on the project himself
4 again to just, using shorthand, move the project forward, and
5 he did so on more than one occasion. In an internal
6 communication with George Esparza, he made it clear that this
7 project needed to be streamlined, and our allegation is that is
8 a result of the bribes that he was being provided from
9 Chairman D.

10 THE COURT: But he doesn't control the votes on
11 that committee. There are other members of the committee that
12 had to vote on the motion. He may have submitted it, but it
13 couldn't be approved unless other -- I don't know what the --
14 if it's a majority of the committee or how many members on the
15 committee. And isn't it customary or it's not unusual for a
16 council member to submit a motion to various committees seeking
17 approval of various projects or various other items of business
18 before the City? I mean, that is the nature of the political
19 fundraising. And looking at a project and determining that the
20 project meets the requirements of the City and it's in the best
21 interest of the City and simply submitting a motion doesn't
22 mean that it is going to be approved or passed or adopted.

23 Was there any opposition to the motion?

24 MR. JENKINS: According to internal
25 documentation, the project having struggled through the entire

1 process for many years including there was prior lawyers, prior
2 lobbyists, or others associated that were ultimately fired or
3 terminated from the project because of the lack of success or
4 maybe lack of timeliness of the success.

5 Your Honor is absolutely correct that the city
6 council job, including Defendant Huizar's, is to vote on things
7 and standing alone, that is absolutely part of their job. And
8 it's also correct that some of those votes actually may benefit
9 the City or benefit the constituents. However, it is an
10 official act according to McDonnell. However, when any amount
11 of money is taken with the idea that it would influence that
12 decision, whether it did or not or whether that decision was
13 actually ultimately beneficial to the community is irrelevant.
14 In fact, it makes it still a crime.

15 And the evidence, at least as alleged in the
16 Indictment, was that Defendant Huizar was accepting money
17 directly and indirectly in representing that it would influence
18 his decision. Ultimately, whether it did or not, again, we
19 would argue is irrelevant, but it is still a violation of his
20 fiduciary duties and also under federal law bribery.

21 THE COURT: Well, just to summarize this
22 Project D, the Government's theory is that the -- there was a
23 certain amount of money that was paid by Company D to the
24 defendant for his assistance in moving Project D through the
25 approval process.

1 What is the total amount of money that, just
2 ballpark, that we are talking about?

3 MR. JENKINS: Yes. There's two forms. There is
4 the \$66,000 in total that went to Huizar Associate One. The
5 other stream of benefits here would be the \$100,000 PAC
6 contribution. That is essentially the next part of the scheme
7 that, according to witnesses, that Defendant Huizar requested
8 in exchange for his help on the project. So 66,000 to Huizar
9 Associate One and then an agreement for an additional \$100,000
10 to PAC that was designed to benefit Defendant Huizar's wife.

11 THE COURT: And the -- what happened to
12 Project D? Were all the entitlements approved, and was it a
13 completed project?

14 MR. JENKINS: It is still an ongoing project, but
15 all the requested assistance that was requested of
16 Defendant Huizar was provided, and it moved through the City
17 approval process significantly at that time meaning that it was
18 slowed for a long period of time and, during this period of
19 time, it was streamlined and the requested approvals were made.
20 So it is on track to be a successful project, but it is still
21 going through.

22 THE COURT: So basically -- and I'm not that
23 familiar -- basically it went through the approval pro --
24 through the approval process, and they're now just doing
25 whatever they are doing to construct it?

1 MR. JENKINS: That is my general understanding
2 also. I don't know the specific details, but we have talked to
3 the company that, according to the company, it is a viable
4 project that is no longer in the risk of not receiving the
5 entitlements. But I do believe there is a lot of construction
6 and related things still to occur.

7 THE COURT: Why don't we move on to Project M.

8 MR. JENKINS: Yes, Your Honor. Project M which
9 begins on page --

10 THE COURT: 49.

11 MR. JENKINS: Thank you. Yes. 49. This relates
12 to a domestic development company, Company M and its project in
13 the Arts District which, fast-forward a little bit, became --
14 was a significant success to Company M according to the
15 internal documentation because of the height of the project
16 was -- set a new precedent and was significantly higher than
17 any other Arts District project.

18 In addition, it was able to obtain significant
19 benefits to the company by reducing the amount and the levels
20 of affordable housing meaning that there was a smaller
21 percentage and a higher amount which ultimately meant that a
22 company would make more money and affordable housing would be
23 more difficult for people below that income and would
24 require -- and would create a fewer amount of affordable
25 housing units than was requested by the City's own planning

1 commission.

2 Starting at the beginning essentially this, as
3 alleged in the Indictment, became -- the relationship with
4 Executive M who worked for -- controlled the Los Angeles area
5 for Company M, Lobbyist B who is alleged to be a close
6 associate fundraiser and -- close associate and fundraiser of
7 Defendant Huizar. He also helped with a PAC, PAC A, which is
8 discussed in the Indictment as a PAC that was purported to be a
9 general purpose committee which means that it was supposed to
10 help various causes and not one specific candidate. But
11 according to Defendant Huizar and Lobbyist B, its true purpose
12 was to benefit Defendant Huizar's ultimate campaign to succeed
13 in Council District 14.

14 The relationship between Executive M, Lobbyist B,
15 and Defendant Huizar ultimately concluded in what is alleged as
16 a bribe that Defendant Huizar requested be paid to this PAC A,
17 ultimately \$100,000 as alleged in the Indictment, in exchange
18 for help on that Project M which I previously described which
19 ultimately occurred meaning the project similarly achieved its
20 request. And some of the requests, as I outlined, were notable
21 because they were very different from what was approved by the
22 City's own planning commission.

23 And, in fact, they were overruled by
24 Defendant Huizar in the PLUM committee which he chaired, the
25 Planning & Land Use Management Committee. It made Executive M

1 and Company M, as alleged in the Indictment, net approximately
2 \$14 million in benefits. In addition, Executive M who,
3 according to the evidence, felt that his job was in danger if
4 this project didn't succeed, and it was paid success bonuses in
5 the hundreds of thousands of dollars for successful projects
6 succeeded, and he was very pleased with that result. And in
7 sum, that is the short summary.

8 THE COURT: Is there an insider in this
9 Project M? Is Esparza percipient to the conduct that you have
10 just outlined?

11 MR. JENKINS: Lobbyist B will testify to the
12 facts related to the communications between Lobbyist B and
13 Defendant Huizar and Lobbyist B and Executive M.

14 In addition, there are -- there's documentary
15 evidence consistent with that, meaning e-mails and some
16 communications. In addition -- that's the core of it,
17 Your Honor, actually.

18 THE COURT: And this Project M needed an
19 amendment to the general plan in order for it to be successful?

20 MR. JENKINS: That is my understanding,
21 Your Honor.

22 THE COURT: And the general plan is approved --
23 how does one amend a general plan in the city government?

24 MR. JENKINS: We will have a city expert explain
25 it much more articulately than I could now. But our

1 understanding is it is generally a big "ask," meaning it does
2 take various levels of approval and in some ways it is sort of
3 a threshold that needs to be achieved before you can move
4 forward with your project.

5 THE COURT: And, again, there are many moving
6 parts to the approval process. Mr. Huizar in and of himself
7 may have influence over certain of the other individuals who
8 are responsible for making those decisions, but he cannot make
9 that decision on his own.

10 MR. JENKINS: I think that is technically
11 correct. Absolutely. However, as we pointed out, in terms of
12 moving parts, Defendant Huizar was on almost all of them
13 meaning, as the council member of CD 14, where the project was,
14 other members will testify that essentially the informal rule
15 is, if that project is supported by the council member or not
16 supported by the council member, that weighs significantly. In
17 addition, as the chair of the PLUM commission, if certain -- if
18 Defendant Huizar doesn't put something on the PLUM calendar, it
19 is essentially frozen in time.

20 THE COURT: Right. On the other hand, if this is
21 something -- and I don't know the process, and I'm sure there
22 is going to be some evidence of it. This particular Project M
23 and the amendment to the general plan may or may not have been
24 beneficial to the city.

25 MR. JENKINS: I think that is absolutely right,

1 Your Honor.

2 THE COURT: So it is the Government's theory that
3 the amendment to the general plan allowing this particular
4 project to go forward as desired by the developers was not in
5 the interest of the city.

6 MR. JENKINS: We don't make that allegation,
7 Your Honor.

8 THE COURT: That's the only way it makes sense.
9 If you're paying somebody for assistance in moving something
10 forward, why would it be improper to move a project along
11 that's in the best interest of the city?

12 MR. JENKINS: According to the Supreme Court case
13 law, the motive behind the acceptance of money in exchange for
14 a project is irrelevant.

15 THE COURT: It may be irrelevant, but you're
16 going to try this case to a jury. Obviously I'm not today
17 making any evidentiary rulings in terms of the evidence that is
18 going to come in or the evidence that is not going to come in,
19 but if you have a project that's in the best interest of the
20 city -- I don't doubt your reliance on the Supreme Court. But
21 as a practical matter, it is not going to have much jury appeal
22 if the project was beneficial for the city, but if it hadn't
23 been Mr. Huizar, it would have been some other politician who
24 promoted the project and ultimately amended the general plan to
25 allow the project to go forward.

1 MR. JENKINS: Yes, Your Honor. I think it's a
2 fair point in terms of jury appeal. I have three responses.
3 One --

4 THE COURT: I know you are very persuasive.

5 MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Your Honor.

6 The first response is it will not be unanimous by
7 any means that this project was to benefit the constituents. I
8 think I'm not going to disclaim that some people may feel that
9 way, but in fact the City's own planning commission had
10 significant reservations about this project when it got to that
11 stage. So the general plan amendment whether this project
12 could -- should be built is step one in a threshold matter.

13 But what that project should ultimately be, there
14 is a host and variety of different opinions in the city of
15 Los Angeles. In the city of Los Angeles, some people like
16 large projects, some people hate large projects. Some people
17 like signage. Some people hate signage.

18 The specific example here most problematically is
19 it's in the Arts District across from skid row where the
20 homelessness right now is rampant. The City Planning
21 Commission said has been advertised by the defendant himself
22 homelessness is a major issue. He had the opportunity to
23 ensure that this project had a significant amount of affordable
24 housing at a low level. You can set affordable housing --
25 there are different levels. Low, medium --

1 THE COURT: I don't mean to interrupt you. I
2 understand where you're going with this, but we will see how
3 the evidence unfolds.

4 In terms of development in the city of
5 Los Angeles or in any community, there are always people
6 against it or people in favor of it and how anything ever gets
7 built is sometimes a mystery.

8 In any event, let's move on to the final scheme
9 which is Businessperson A. And my understanding of
10 Businessperson A -- and you can correct me if I'm wrong -- that
11 this individual was working with the FBI in connection with the
12 conduct that you have alleged in these overt acts 290 and 296?

13 MR. JENKINS: No, Your Honor. You are correct
14 that at some point Businessperson A started working with the
15 FBI. That was not until August 2017. The allegations in overt
16 acts 257 through -- this is the chart -- 257 through 269 all
17 preceded his work on behalf of the FBI.

18 THE COURT: All right. So after he engaged in
19 the activities that you have alleged in these overt acts, he
20 decided that he would cooperate with the FBI and provide the
21 FBI with the information that is alleged in these overt acts.

22 MR. JENKINS: That is correct, Your Honor.

23 THE COURT: Okay. And just in the thumbnail,
24 what were the -- what was the -- what were the -- what was
25 Businessperson A getting out of the -- what did he expect in

1 return for the contributions that you have alleged to the PAC?

2 MR. JENKINS: Yes. The contributions as
3 enumerated, the cash, hotel accommodations, and other suits and
4 luxury items.

5 THE COURT: Is that that whole list of items
6 including suits and shirts?

7 MR. JENKINS: Yes, Your Honor.

8 THE COURT: And shoes?

9 MR. JENKINS: Yes.

10 THE COURT: Pair of shoes?

11 MR. JENKINS: I would describe them as luxury
12 attire, but yes, Your Honor. In exchange for those benefits,
13 among others provided by Businessperson A, it is our
14 understanding based on interviews --

15 THE COURT: Does he simply drop off a pair of
16 \$400 shoes, or how are they sized?

17 MR. JENKINS: My understanding from various
18 witnesses is that Defendant Huizar, oftentimes George Esparza,
19 and Businessperson A would travel to custom locations that
20 would make suits, for example, where he would get fitted, get a
21 suit, and Businessperson A would provide the money in cash
22 directly to the --

23 THE COURT: So Businessperson A had a tab at this
24 place, and they would go in and order various items, and then
25 they never paid -- they didn't have to pay for them.

1 MR. JENKINS: Businessperson A actually paid in
2 cash.

3 THE COURT: Paid in cash.

4 MR. JENKINS: He has receipts for those.

5 THE COURT: I didn't mean to interrupt you. Go
6 ahead.

7 MR. JENKINS: Not at all, Your Honor.

8 In exchange for those and other benefits,
9 Businessperson A, who had various businesses, sort of generally
10 speaking, who could benefit by being hired as a subcontractor
11 to development projects. Again, a large hotel, a large
12 redevelopment, he could provide certain amenities that would
13 benefit one or two of his companies. He had multiple
14 companies. He requested --

15 THE COURT: Was this the cabinetmaker?

16 MR. JENKINS: It is, Your Honor.

17 THE COURT: So the cabinetmaker that was involved
18 in Mr. Englander's case?

19 MR. JENKINS: It is the same Businessperson A
20 that provided cash to then Council Member Englander, yes. For
21 a similar reason, here, clearly the relationship was more
22 developed according to the evidence, meaning more interactions,
23 more trips, more benefits but the same purpose. He could
24 benefit Businessperson A.

25 He or she could benefit by introductions and

1 advocacy by Council Member Huizar who had a very close
2 relationship, as evidenced by this Indictment, with various
3 developers, various lobbyists, various chairmen who, when
4 looking who to hire for certain aspects of a project and
5 wanting to please the council member who chaired PLUM, who was
6 the council member in their district, it is -- we would argue
7 and allege it is an easy give to the council member to hire the
8 council member's friend, hire someone the council member
9 recommends, hire someone the council member introduces you to,
10 and essentially Businessperson A was paying for that
11 opportunity which was provided on multiple occasions.

12 THE COURT: But isn't that the way that business
13 is done?

14 MR. JENKINS: No, Your Honor. Not legally.

15 THE COURT: You have a relationship with
16 Developer A, and I'm a cabinet builder, and you know me. I
17 build good cabinets. So you arrange a lunch between the three
18 of us, we go to lunch, and we talk about what a great
19 cabinetmaker I am. Obviously the point or suggestion is to the
20 developer that you should hire Judge Walter to build your
21 cabinets because he's a good cabinetmaker.

22 Those kinds of conversations and those kinds of
23 introductions, I would take it, before the pandemic, happened
24 multiple times on a daily basis, not just with respect to City
25 employees or councilmen but -- and I guess what you're going to

1 tell me is there is a distinction between that conduct by a
2 city councilman who receives what you have alleged to be bribes
3 which are contributions to what looks like they're Political
4 Action Committees -- there's a distinction between that and
5 private individuals doing that.

6 So my example, if you ended up receiving a trip
7 to Las Vegas from me for the introduction, that wouldn't be a
8 crime.

9 MR. JENKINS: Standing alone that may not be a
10 crime, Your Honor.

11 THE COURT: Private individuals. My hypothetical
12 is taking your title of assistant and taking my title as a
13 judge, three individuals getting together for an introduction
14 for purposes of doing business. The business relationship is
15 formed, and I make a lot of money building cabinets. And in
16 exchange for that, I call you up one day and say, hey, here is
17 a week at the hotel of your choice in Las Vegas and it's on me.
18 That's not a crime, is it?

19 MR. JENKINS: That is correct, Your Honor.

20 THE COURT: Pardon me?

21 MR. JENKINS: That is correct, Your Honor. It is
22 not.

23 THE COURT: Okay.

24 MR. JENKINS: So the difference here is, one,
25 when it is a city official, there is a host of different

1 applications including that, if the city official accepts money
2 with the idea that it's solicited to influence his decision one
3 way or the other in his official capacities, whatever he does
4 as a result of that, that is illegal, meaning his taking of the
5 money at that point, meaning he is being paid because that
6 individual wants him to use his official capacity to influence
7 an official account is illegal.

8 THE COURT: All right. Let me stop you.

9 So then we are talking about the evidence, and
10 you're talking about the defendant's -- in this case, the
11 defendant's intent in receiving that money. So do you have any
12 direct evidence of the defendant's intent that I'm going to --
13 there has been "X" dollars paid and now I'm going to go out and
14 I'm going to do "X" in exchange for the money that has been
15 paid to me? Or is it all circumstantial evidence?

16 MR. JENKINS: It is direct evidence based off
17 Businessperson A's testimony of conversations with the
18 defendant.

19 THE COURT: So he's going to say I told the
20 defendant that I'm going to give him "X" amount of dollars. In
21 exchange, he's going to introduce me to various developers?

22 MR. JENKINS: I would say not in that exact
23 sentence, but in that exact conversation, yes. In addition,
24 there is recorded evidence of this.

25 THE COURT: And why is that -- I understand the

1 defendant is a council member, but why would that impact his,
2 for lack of a better word, his official duties? Yes, he is a
3 councilman, but now he knows Businessman A who makes cabinets
4 and -- I guess it's the connection -- the payment to the
5 Political Action Committee that makes it a crime?

6 MR. JENKINS: Two parts. Very good question.
7 One is the payment that is requested whether it is to the
8 Political Action Committee or by way of suits and shirts or by
9 way of cash under the table. That payment, particularly here,
10 it was never recorded which suggests there is some illicit
11 intent. That payment alone may be a gift violation, may be an
12 ethics violation. But if there are just these payments that
13 were not reported but it shows illicit intent, the crime is not
14 completed there.

15 THE COURT: But there is no quid pro quo here for
16 conduct in his capacity as a city councilman.

17 MR. JENKINS: It's a good question; so I'm taking
18 a little while to answer it.

19 The next step is when that conversation occurs,
20 which, again, where there is evidence directly from
21 Businessperson A, from George Esparza, from other developers
22 who are at these meetings, then the crime becomes when what is
23 leveraged by the council member is, developer, either
24 implicitly or explicitly, if you don't hire my friend, you're
25 not going to get your project approved or you risk adverse

1 action in CPC or PLUM or city council. So that developer
2 thinking, okay, well, we need cabinets. We might as well hire
3 Businessperson A and not risk Council Member Huizar's ire by
4 not hiring his friend.

5 THE COURT: I understand. The businessperson --
6 is it a man or woman?

7 MR. JENKINS: He is a man.

8 THE COURT: All right. So the businessman in
9 this case I was trying to figure out because it's different
10 than -- I mean, it's the same theory, but it's a round -- in a
11 roundabout fashion.

12 MR. JENKINS: Exactly, Your Honor.

13 THE COURT: All right. Okay.

14 MR. JENKINS: In addition, that businessperson
15 also paid for a similar resolution that -- not as -- a similar
16 resolution that Chairman E previously got but not as
17 significant but who also alleged that is also what he was
18 paying for.

19 THE COURT: These resolutions are basically
20 saying he's a good guy?

21 MR. JENKINS: It depends. There's actually
22 various kinds of resolutions.

23 THE COURT: You know what you see on TV every
24 night, somebody standing there and they hold up a resolution
25 saying Mr. Jenkins is the prosecutor of the year recognized by

1 the City.

2 MR. JENKINS: Hopefully one day, Your Honor. But
3 at this point, there's different kinds of resolutions.

4 THE COURT: But what do they -- all it does is --
5 okay. I mean, I guess they have a benefit, but I'm having a
6 hard time seeing the real benefit and, more importantly, paying
7 thousands and thousands of dollars to have the resolution
8 passed. But I'm sure you're going to have very powerful
9 evidence of that.

10 MR. JENKINS: And I believe that concludes the
11 five schemes, Your Honor.

12 THE COURT: All right. Then let's move to
13 something that -- and I'm trying to get through this because
14 now I want to start focusing on more specific items, and that
15 is statements that were made by the -- made by the defendant.
16 I realize that, if I'm correct, Count 33 is the one that you
17 have charged as a false statement. We discussed that false
18 statement and the evidence around that.

19 This was an interview -- how does this interview
20 on April 10, 2019, come to be? And who -- who are the
21 participants? And is this a *Miranda* warning that is provided?

22 MR. JENKINS: I will answer all of that,
23 Your Honor.

24 The short version is that, after the execution of
25 various search warrants targeting Defendant Huizar and others,

1 he retained counsel immediately on the spot. Shortly
2 thereafter, counsel and the U.S. Attorney's Office engaged in
3 negotiation discussions, and there were three interviews where
4 Defendant Huizar was represented by counsel, the first on
5 December 18, 2018. There is another interview on
6 January 3rd, 2019. And then what underlies Count 33 is the
7 interview of April 10, 2019.

8 Defendant Huizar was represented by two retained
9 counsel. The interviews took place at that counsel's offices
10 on behalf of the Government with some combination of myself,
11 AUSA Veronica Dragalin, AUSA Melissa Mills,
12 Special Agent Andrew Civetti, and Special Agent Tony Logan.
13 The interviews were not recorded at Defendant Huizar's request.
14 The interviews covered a host of topics, and they were covered
15 by what is called a proffer agreement which is essentially a
16 letter agreement in very short form, provides limited use
17 immunity.

18 THE COURT: My notes -- I just started looking at
19 this over the weekend. I had four interviews. There was the
20 April 10, 2019, interview, and then there were three additional
21 interviews. So there are only three -- the December 18 -- the
22 December 2018, January of '19, and April of '19?

23 MR. JENKINS: Yes, Your Honor. The three that
24 you just --

25 THE COURT: All right. And were there any

1 admissions made during the course of any of those interviews?

2 MR. JENKINS: Admissions, yes. It's sort of
3 complicated to get into the details, and they were pursuant to
4 a proffer agreement.

5 THE COURT: Let me interrupt you.

6 The Government doesn't intend or the Government
7 can't use any of the statements that were made during any of
8 these except for the -- obviously the false statement that is
9 charged based on the terms of the proffer agreement?

10 MR. JENKINS: Our position is that we can.
11 Whether we will or not is yet to be decided, but we provided
12 notice to prior counsel and the current counsel that we --
13 because we believe he violated the terms of that written
14 proffer agreement according to its own terms, we are no longer
15 bound by it. At this point, I would have to double check, but
16 the evidence that is presented in the Indictment is based off
17 independent evidence.

18 THE COURT: Is it inappropriate this morning to
19 discuss the admissions made by the defendant during those
20 proffers?

21 MR. JENKINS: I believe that is correct that we
22 would prefer not to do so in open court, Your Honor.

23 THE COURT: All right. But there were admissions
24 made during those proffers?

25 MR. JENKINS: That is a fair assessment, yes,

1 Your Honor.

2 THE COURT: And the Government has not decided as
3 to whether or not it will attempt to use it but has given
4 notice to counsel?

5 MR. JENKINS: That is accurate, Your Honor.

6 THE COURT: All right. And I take it that
7 those -- although they weren't recorded, that there was a 302
8 prepared?

9 MR. JENKINS: According by all accounts very
10 lengthy and detailed 302s that are approximately 20 pages.

11 THE COURT: Agent Civetti is very thorough in his
12 documentation.

13 MR. JENKINS: You are correct, Your Honor.

14 THE COURT: You didn't take any notes, did you?

15 MR. JENKINS: No, Your Honor. I was doing the
16 talking.

17 THE COURT: Okay. So that answers my question
18 with respect to statements.

19 The next question I have is with respect to
20 search warrants. I'm being guarded here because I have read
21 some in camera materials that -- let me just ask the broad
22 question.

23 I take it, in addition to the search warrant for
24 the defendant's residence and his office, there were other
25 search warrants that were sought and executed in this case?

1 MR. JENKINS: Yes, Your Honor. Both directly as
2 to Defendant Huizar and co-conspirators and others.

3 THE COURT: All right. So of all of the search
4 warrants as to individuals other than the defendant, this
5 defendant is not going to have any standing to challenge those
6 search warrants; correct?

7 MR. JENKINS: That is my understanding, yes,
8 Your Honor.

9 THE COURT: Does the defense dispute that or is
10 it too soon for you to -- I realize you're new to the case. So
11 if you're uncomfortable in responding to any of my questions, I
12 fully understand that because I'm sure there is a great deal of
13 discovery. But have you had any chance to look at this issue?

14 MS. ALE: No, Your Honor. We haven't received
15 the search warrants yet.

16 THE COURT: Okay.

17 MS. ALE: Just briefly, Your Honor, as to the
18 characterization of Mr. Huizar's statements as admissions, we
19 have not yet had an opportunity to review those --

20 THE COURT: I understand. That's why I deferred
21 any discussion of those statements that were made during those
22 proffers. So I want to make sure you have an opportunity to
23 look at all the discovery, and if there is going to be
24 litigation over that issue, we will decide it. So I'm not --
25 I'm trying to get a sense of timing in terms of what is

1 involved in the motion practice in this case.

2 There was a search of Mr. Huizar's residence.
3 Let me ask the Government. Were there digital devices that
4 were seized, and has the search of those digital devices been
5 completed and ready to turn over to the defense?

6 MR. JENKINS: Yes. And mostly there is one --
7 there were multiple devices seized including the defendant's
8 personal phone, laptops, and other devices. There was a -- and
9 those have all been processed, reviewed, and ready to -- I
10 would say ready to be downloaded to a platform that can be
11 viewable. But that process is still taking time, but we have
12 completed our portion of review.

13 THE COURT: All right. So those would be
14 available -- if the defendant dropped off a hard drive, they
15 would be available to download on the platform that the defense
16 would deliver to the Government?

17 MR. JENKINS: Yes, Your Honor. That is the part
18 that is in process. We are currently, I think as we speak,
19 downloading other digital evidence that the Court may be aware
20 of that is going first. But we are in the process of
21 downloading a series of digital evidence, and they have
22 provided a hard drive.

23 There is one additional phone that was seized
24 later in the investigation that we have not been able to
25 access; so that search continues.

1 THE COURT: And the warrant that was executed at
2 the defendant's office, all those materials -- I remember
3 seeing a picture of somebody parading out a bunch of files.
4 Has the Government made a determination in terms of what it is
5 going to return to the defendant and what it is going to keep
6 as evidence?

7 MR. JENKINS: Some digital -- at least one phone
8 has been returned. In terms of hard copy documents, they have
9 been reviewed. We haven't made a determination of what -- if
10 anything is to be returned.

11 THE COURT: And were there computers in his
12 office that were also seized?

13 MR. JENKINS: The Government computers, they were
14 seized. And I believe in conversations with the city
15 attorney's office, we are working with whether to provide
16 them -- so the City documents and City digital devices, whether
17 we are going to return it to the City. So that is an ongoing
18 conversation.

19 THE COURT: But your analysis of those devices
20 has been completed?

21 MR. JENKINS: Yes, Your Honor.

22 THE COURT: Okay. Then the other question I have
23 is were there any wiretaps in this case?

24 MR. JENKINS: There were, Your Honor.

25 THE COURT: And how many different applications

1 and how many different target telephones were intercepted? And
2 the more important question is how many calls were intercepted,
3 and does the Government have any estimate as to the number of
4 those calls that it might seek to introduce as evidence at
5 trial?

6 MR. JENKINS: Generally, yes, Your Honor.
7 Working, if I recall correctly, backwards in your -- forward in
8 your questions, there are approximately eight applications for
9 interceptions of various kinds meaning texts, wire or phones,
10 and in addition audio/video bug that took place over the time
11 period of April 2017 to November 2018 with an approximate
12 six-month break and other sort of breaks in between. But,
13 again, there is approximately eight applications. The number
14 of phones were approximately six phones, and in addition, the
15 audio/video bug that we mentioned.

16 Specifically as to Defendant Huizar's phone, it
17 was intercepted over an approximately 60-day time period.
18 There's sort of various ways to calculate the amount of data.
19 The best way and most efficient way, at least we found helpful,
20 is how many pages the line sheets are, meaning those are pretty
21 fully transcribed of the communications, texts or phones that
22 were intercepted.

23 As for Defendant Huizar, the 60-day intercepted
24 period was around 400 pages. By comparison, the other phones
25 that were intercepted that we are currently processing to

1 provide in discovery would include, for example, George Chiang,
2 and his pages were 1,500 approximately. So by comparison,
3 Defendant Huizar's 403 pages is smaller than George Chiang.

4 THE COURT: When you say line sheets, is that --
5 are those -- do those represent the conversations that the
6 Government intends to introduce into evidence, or those
7 represent the entirety of the conversations that were
8 intercepted during the 60-day period of time?

9 MR. JENKINS: The latter.

10 THE COURT: Okay.

11 MR. JENKINS: So the biggest picture is that
12 403 pages. And then the best evidence of what we currently
13 intend -- and we are pretty diligent. We wouldn't want to
14 limit ourselves to it, but the calls that are referenced in the
15 Indictment itself are the ones we currently intend to
16 introduce. We haven't limited it to that, but those are
17 certainly a significant amount and significant source of the
18 evidence.

19 THE COURT: So there won't be any difficulty in
20 preparing transcripts for those?

21 MR. JENKINS: No, Your Honor. They are largely
22 transcribed verbatim. They are draft format but largely
23 already prepared that way.

24 THE COURT: And all of the wiretap information,
25 the affidavits, the applications, that is all available for the

1 defendant?

2 MR. JENKINS: That will be, I think -- we will
3 turn to the next phase of the production.

4 We have a current production right now that is
5 going to include all of the recordings and the line sheets,
6 meaning what is available probably tomorrow. Probably tomorrow
7 will be the actual content of the recordings and the
8 transcribed line sheets. The underlying applications and host
9 of other pleadings are still being processed for various
10 reasons. But we are getting through in some ways the good
11 stuff and still working on discovery, and we can get to that.

12 THE COURT: I may have misheard you, but I
13 thought you -- you referred to an audio or a video bug.

14 MR. JENKINS: Yes, Your Honor.

15 THE COURT: What was that? What is that?

16 MR. JENKINS: There were two locations that were
17 not locations of Defendant Huizar's that were for approximately
18 a 60-day period. Pursuant to court order, there were
19 audio/video bugs installed by the FBI.

20 THE COURT: And was the defendant captured on any
21 of those?

22 MR. JENKINS: I do not believe so, Your Honor.
23 And there is nothing in the Indictment that relies on such
24 interceptions.

25 THE COURT: Okay.

1 MR. JENKINS: There may be one interception not
2 of the defendant but his reference in the Indictment as
3 AUSA Dragalin points out to me.

4 THE COURT: So we talked about the seizures, the
5 search warrants, the wiretaps. What other types of documentary
6 evidence -- obviously you have -- I'm sure, based upon this
7 type of a case, you're going to have a lot of documents
8 relating to bank records, Las Vegas casino records, airline
9 records. And there is a whole -- how many pages of those
10 documents do you think are out there?

11 MR. JENKINS: Yes. I will break it down as
12 best --

13 THE COURT: Actually, it's easier just to -- are
14 those ready to give to the defense?

15 MR. JENKINS: Some yes and some no. So things
16 like the -- as you pointed out, the e-mails -- we did various
17 e-mail search warrants. Those are ready. Actually, I will go
18 through what's ready right now.

19 There are various e-mail search warrants that
20 underlie several of the allegations in the Indictment. There
21 are seven custodians of e-mails, meaning seven people's e-mails
22 we intercepted. That's ready to go. The line sheets and
23 recordings that we just discussed as to four of the phones that
24 were intercepted will be produced along with the audio.
25 There's about 15,000 FBI reports that relate to various

1 interviews including attachments, photos, and other documents
2 that were provided. That is all ready to go as of ideally
3 tomorrow. It's being processed right now.

4 THE COURT: All those written by Agent Civetti?

5 MR. JENKINS: Too many of them but not all of
6 them. There were various agents dutifully helping out. Not
7 all Agent Civetti.

8 There is significant -- in total what would be
9 available tomorrow is around 83,000 pages in addition to the
10 four custodians of the interceptions.

11 THE COURT: That should be easy. Mr. Snyder can
12 review those over the weekend. It will be ready on Monday.

13 MR. SNYDER: Yes, Your Honor.

14 MR. JENKINS: That was, in fact, his quote when
15 we told him that I believe. But he tells us he was joking.

16 In addition, what is still being processed is
17 some of the things Your Honor just mentioned meaning bank
18 records, casino records, third-party productions. Those are
19 taking additional time to process in addition to obviously the
20 pandemic. All of our documents are stored offsite because
21 Department of Justice process is different -- different items
22 there. And then our paralegals are working remotely. So we
23 are trying to work through it as fast as we can, but we do have
24 a lot of material.

25 In addition, there are certain things like PII or

1 personal identifying information, again, date of birth or
2 addresses and certain business information that we have to
3 review and redact in order to provide to the defense and make
4 sure we are not inadvertently disclosing anything that should
5 remain private. That is on its way.

6 THE COURT: I believe I signed a protective order
7 yesterday that you folks had submitted.

8 MR. JENKINS: Yes, Your Honor.

9 THE COURT: All right. The final questions that
10 I have -- maybe you answered this. The Count 34 tax returns
11 for the years 2017 and 2018, were those joint returns?

12 MR. JENKINS: Yes, Your Honor.

13 THE COURT: Is there any intention on the part of
14 the Government to charge the other filer or the other signer of
15 those returns?

16 MR. JENKINS: At this point, Your Honor, the
17 determination, subject to new or different evidence being
18 obtained, is there are no plans to charge the other signer.

19 THE COURT: Were these professionally prepared or
20 prepared by the defendant?

21 MR. JENKINS: They were professionally prepared,
22 Your Honor.

23 THE COURT: All right. And the amounts of money
24 the Government claims were underreported for those years was
25 what?

1 MR. JENKINS: Just to clarify, it actually just
2 charges 2017 return. That is a number that is still being
3 evaluated. It could be anywhere from \$50,000 to over
4 \$2 million. We are still evaluating basically how to calculate
5 income, but it would be in that range.

6 THE COURT: All right. And then I think we
7 discussed it, but let me go back. On the money laundering
8 counts where we have money laundering through family members --
9 Relative A-1, A-2, and A-3 -- does the Government have any
10 intention of naming any of those individuals?

11 MR. JENKINS: At this point, Your Honor, subject
12 to any new or different evidence being obtained, they provided
13 statements pursuant to letter immunity. We expect them to
14 testify as to that, but we currently have no plans to charge
15 them.

16 THE COURT: All right. Let's talk about it. How
17 many --

18 MR. JENKINS: Witnesses, Your Honor?

19 THE COURT: I lost my train of thought. There is
20 one other note that I have.

21 The search of the defendant's residence took
22 place in November of 2018?

23 MR. JENKINS: Yes. November 7, 2018.

24 THE COURT: And one of the items that was seized
25 was the -- was \$129,000 in cash?

1 MR. JENKINS: That is correct, Your Honor.

2 THE COURT: And that, the Government's theory is,
3 came from Chairman E and businessperson -- Businessman A?

4 MR. JENKINS: Yes. That is our understanding.

5 THE COURT: All right. How many witnesses --
6 your estimate to the number of witnesses you will be calling?

7 MR. JENKINS: Yes, Your Honor. Our current
8 estimate as charged would be approximately 40 to 50 witnesses.
9 I can outline if Your Honor --

10 THE COURT: How many cooperators?

11 MR. JENKINS: There currently will be four.
12 However, we are -- it is an ongoing investigation, and we
13 anticipate there will be additional.

14 THE COURT: And how many will be testifying
15 pursuant to immunity?

16 MR. JENKINS: At this point none of the four, no.
17 Zero of the four will be testifying pursuant to immunity.
18 Three --

19 THE COURT: What was the purpose of the immunity
20 grant if they're not going to testify?

21 MR. JENKINS: So let me rephrase it. I guess it
22 depends what the Court means by "cooperators." I was referring
23 to people who actually have been charged with criminal conduct
24 who in return for expected or hoped leniency will be testifying
25 on behalf of the Government, and that is referencing

1 George Esparza, Justin Kim, George Chiang. As to the prior
2 questions, the relatives will be testifying pursuant to letter
3 immunity which does not mean they will not be charged. It just
4 means we will not use their statements against them to charge
5 them. But as I pointed out, at this point we don't have plans
6 to charge them based off the evidence.

7 THE COURT: But they will be testifying.

8 MR. JENKINS: Yes, Your Honor.

9 THE COURT: Okay.

10 MR. JENKINS: Just to clarify, Businessperson A,
11 we have not yet determined any resolution. Businessperson A is
12 not currently charged, and his resolution has not been
13 determined.

14 THE COURT: How many experts does the Government
15 expect to call?

16 MR. JENKINS: Approximately -- depending on if we
17 can consolidate, I would say five to six. Just a few examples
18 would be either a City process expert or PLUM expert, FBI CART
19 examiner which does essentially their cyber extractions,
20 somebody from the FPPC or Fair Political Practices Commission,
21 and potentially someone from City ethics would discuss certain
22 reporting requirements such as the Form 700 or the revolving
23 door policy that covers City employees.

24 THE COURT: You know, I don't want to go back,
25 but I guess I missed -- I didn't miss but we didn't discuss --

1 because you're -- from what you said before, one of your
2 theories is that, when I was talking about my cabinetmaker
3 example, that there is a -- one of the differences is that
4 the -- that these -- I don't want to mischaracterize it. It
5 was the Government's theory that these payments were -- the
6 majority of these payments should have been disclosed on
7 various financial disclosure forms that are required by the
8 City?

9 MR. JENKINS: Yes, Your Honor.

10 THE COURT: The Government's evidence is that
11 they were not.

12 MR. JENKINS: Yes, Your Honor.

13 THE COURT: Okay. And those are captured by
14 overt acts 317 to 384 commencing at paragraph 71, the
15 concealment of illicit benefits?

16 MR. JENKINS: Yes, Your Honor.

17 THE COURT: Okay. And the final question I have
18 is what is the Government seeking to forfeit in this case?

19 MR. JENKINS: At this point they are general
20 notice allegations, and we discussed with our -- we have two
21 assigned forfeiture AUSA's who unfortunately are not here. But
22 they have advised -- right now it is a notice allegation
23 meaning nothing has been seized that we are seeking to forfeit.
24 We have not identified specific assets. But according to the
25 case law, including in racketeering, there are various things

1 that are subject to forfeit if they can be identified. I would
2 also defer the more specifics to our asset forfeiture AUSA's.
3 But that is our current understanding to the notice allegation
4 or general allegation.

5 THE COURT: Those forfeiture issues are -- I'm
6 very familiar with the forfeiture allegations. I would
7 encourage you to, as you have indicated, consult with your
8 forfeiture AUSA's because waiting until the last minute runs
9 into nothing but problems in terms of trying to instruct the
10 jury. I have had that -- I have had that issue and that
11 problem before. So I encourage you to become educated and rely
12 on those people who have some expertise in the forfeiture area.

13 MR. JENKINS: Yes, Your Honor. We will do so
14 definitely.

15 THE COURT: All right. I think -- so the
16 Government's estimate in terms of the amount of time to try
17 this case is -- I notice you filed a notice of complex case
18 which I agree with, but your current estimate is how many days?

19 MR. JENKINS: For the Government's case in chief,
20 15 to 20 trial days.

21 THE COURT: All right. And how many exhibits do
22 you think you're going to have?

23 MR. JENKINS: I expect it to be voluminous, in
24 the hundreds. We haven't yet begun that process, but I think
25 we can expect that it will be voluminous.

1 THE COURT: Hundreds or thousands?

2 MR. JENKINS: A lot of evidence is going to be
3 recordings and testimony. So while it is a complex case, a lot
4 of it will be percipient. But to be conservative, it could
5 reach the thousands. I don't want to understate it also.

6 THE COURT: I have a procedure that you may or
7 may not be familiar with with respect to the exchange of those
8 trial exhibits in terms of when it gets closer to trial to try
9 to resolve -- it's basically a disclosure of all the trial
10 exhibits to the defense and then a meet and confer so you can
11 resolve any objections, and then I will work with counsel to
12 resolve those objections because there is nothing that delays a
13 trial more than fighting about objections to exhibits which
14 typically are going to come in. In any event, we will deal
15 with that.

16 MR. JENKINS: Yes, Your Honor. Understood.

17 THE COURT: All right. So unless the Government
18 has anything to add, I'm going to -- I have a couple questions
19 for the defense.

20 I think what I'm going to do is I'm going to set
21 a trial in this matter for September -- I'm sorry -- September
22 29th of 2020. That is really going to be a placeholder date.
23 I'm going to issue a Criminal Trial Order today based upon that
24 date. But what I want to do is I want to have counsel within
25 the next ten days meet and confer and discuss discovery. And I

1 know that you're rolling out this discovery, but I want you to
2 meet and confer and set some benchmarks in terms of when you
3 believe you will be able to produce all the discovery.

4 And I want you to discuss motion practice and
5 then prepare a proposed stipulation setting forth a schedule
6 that counsel believe is an appropriate schedule for the conduct
7 of the pretrial matters in this case and also a trial date, and
8 then I will look at the stipulation. And if it is acceptable,
9 I will sign off, and if not, we may have another hearing so I
10 can better understand the dates you selected.

11 I will ask you to file that stipulation by -- I
12 don't have a calendar down here but August 14th. Do you think
13 that is a doable date?

14 MR. JENKINS: Yes, Your Honor.

15 MS. ALE: Yes, Your Honor.

16 THE COURT: Okay. There is one additional issue
17 that I want to raise with the defense, and that is the -- I
18 have reviewed the pleadings that resulted in the order
19 conditionally appointing counsel for the defendant. That
20 ex parte application, the first one was filed in early June.
21 The ex parte application for the appointment of the Office of
22 the Federal Public Defender was denied by the magistrate judge
23 who heard that motion or reviewed those pleadings. The finding
24 was the defendant had not satisfied his burden to establish
25 that the appointment of the Office of the Federal Public

1 Defender as counsel to the defendant is warranted at this time,
2 and the application was denied without prejudice.

3 That application was subsequently renewed in a
4 second request in July in an in camera filing, and that
5 resulted in the order of magistrate judge on July 24 of
6 obviously this year for the appointment of the Federal Public
7 Defender's Office with an order of contribution by Mr. Huizar
8 of \$3,000 per month. That appears as docket No. 31.

9 I intend to look at the -- I have looked at and I
10 have some concerns that Mr. Huizar may not qualify for the
11 appointment of counsel.

12 MS. ALE: Your Honor, sorry to interrupt. I
13 believe that this may be a matter --

14 THE COURT: You can be seated and get closer to
15 the microphone because I'm having a hard time hearing you. I
16 know we're all hampered, but go ahead.

17 MS. ALE: Thank you, Your Honor. I believe this
18 may be a matter that is best discussed out of the presence of
19 the public and the Government. This is usually an issue
20 decided between the defendant and the Court.

21 THE COURT: Well, it may be. But I have some
22 questions that I'm going to require you to respond to. You can
23 respond to them in camera. They're very general. So I don't
24 necessarily agree with you that it should not be a -- I don't
25 necessarily disagree with you.

1 My analysis is hampered by the lack of specific
2 information. So I'm going to order the defendant to provide a
3 personal declaration addressing the issues with respect to home
4 equity, the proceeds from the rental property, and a
5 description as to the liability that was included in the
6 financial affidavit. And I'm going to ask that there be a
7 current balance sheet prepared by a professional accountant.

8 I know that the financial affidavit that you use
9 in many of these cases -- in most all of these cases is a form.
10 But when you have a case of this complexity in terms of
11 financial information, even though there was a schedule
12 attached to the financial affidavit, it didn't provide me
13 sufficient information with respect to certain of those
14 entities. So I'm going to need an elaboration of the schedule
15 that is attached to the financial affidavit which was signed on
16 July 14 of 2020.

17 So if -- I was going to ask or set a deadline for
18 that of August 17th. Is that something that you think you can
19 accomplish by August 17th, or do you need more time?

20 MS. ALE: I believe that is sufficient time,
21 Your Honor.

22 THE COURT: Okay. And I will allow you to file
23 that in camera. But I want a much more thorough analysis of
24 the schedule, the items that are listed in the schedule because
25 I have my concerns that Mr. Huizar may not qualify for the

1 services of a public defender. We will cross that bridge after
2 I have an opportunity to review your filing.

3 MS. ALE: Understood, Your Honor. I would just
4 flag that I do believe we attached as one of the exhibits a
5 statement regarding the proceeds of the rental sale. To the
6 extent it is not included in the application or the Court
7 doesn't have that, we will provide that in the filing on the
8 17th.

9 THE COURT: Okay. So you are saying it was not
10 attached.

11 MS. ALE: I don't remember offhand at the moment.

12 THE COURT: I didn't see it.

13 MS. ALE: I can provide that to the Court.

14 THE COURT: Okay. I know there were some
15 declarations that were submitted in connection with the
16 application, but I need much more detail in terms of the
17 information that is set forth in those -- in that schedule and
18 those declarations.

19 All right. I appreciate counsel's efforts this
20 morning. I know there's going to be a substantial amount of
21 work that is going to be involved in this case. It's my
22 observation that having good counsel in this case is going to
23 be beneficial to all concerned because a lot of these issues
24 that typically arise in these type of cases are able to be
25 resolved by good counsel who understand their -- the strengths

1 and weaknesses of their cases and can make the preparation and
2 the trial go a lot smoother. So I look forward to working with
3 both of you.

4 Does the Government have anything else?

5 MR. JENKINS: No. We appreciate the Court's
6 comments and will endeavor to live up to them.

7 MS. ALE: Nothing further from the defense.

8 THE COURT: All right. With that we will be in
9 recess. Everybody stay safe.

10 MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Your Honor. You too.

11 (Proceedings concluded at 9:53 a.m.)
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER

2

3

4

5 I, MIRANDA ALGORRI, FEDERAL OFFICIAL REALTIME

6 COURT REPORTER, IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR

7 THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT

8 PURSUANT TO SECTION 753, TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE THAT THE

9 FOREGOING IS A TRUE AND CORRECT TRANSCRIPT OF THE

10 STENOGRAPHICALLY REPORTED PROCEEDINGS HELD IN THE

11 ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER AND THAT THE TRANSCRIPT PAGE FORMAT IS IN

12 CONFORMANCE WITH THE REGULATIONS OF THE JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF

13 THE UNITED STATES.

14

15 DATED THIS 7TH DAY OF AUGUST, 2020.

16

17

18 /S/ MIRANDA ALGORRI

19 _____
MIRANDA ALGORRI, CSR NO. 12743, CRR
20 FEDERAL OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

21

22

23

24

25